

VZCZCXRO7228  
OO RUEHSL  
DE RUEHVEN #0235/01 2951414  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
O 221414Z OCT 09  
FM USMISSION USOSCE  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6664  
INFO RUCNCFE/CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE PRIORITY  
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO PRIORITY 1759  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUESDT/DTRA-OSSES DARMSTADT GE PRIORITY  
RHMFISS/CDR USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC//J5-DDPMA-IN/CAC/DDPMA-E// PRIORITY  
RUEAHQA/HQ USAF WASHINGTON DC//XONP// PRIORITY  
RUEADWD/DA WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RUEASWA/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAE PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 USOSCE 000235

SENSITIVE  
SIPDIS

STATE FOR VCI/CCA, EUR/RPM  
NSC FOR NILSSON, HAYDEN  
JCS FOR J5 NORWOOD, COL SMITH  
OSD FOR ISA (KEHL, WALLENDER, ALBERQUE)

E.O. 12958: DECL: 05/20/2018  
TAGS: [KCFE](#) [OSCE](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#)  
SUBJECT: OSCE/FSC: RUSSIAN PROPOSAL TO REVIEW VIENNA  
DOCUMENT 1999; MISSION REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE

REF: A. USOSCE 71  
[1](#)B. STATE 093327

Classified By: Acting Chief Arms Control Delegate Chris Ellis,  
for reasons 1.4(b) and (d).

[1](#)1. (SBU) In an informal meeting with a small group of delegations on the margins of the October 20 Joint Consultative Group (JCG), Russian Head of Arms Control Delegation Ambassador Mikhail Ulyanov shared a draft proposal that would task the Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) to conduct a review of Vienna Document 1999 (VD99) to identify areas and provisions that require updating and further development. Russia invited France, Germany, Spain, Luxembourg, Belarus, Italy, Portugal, and Turkey to its informal meeting. Ulyanov also shared the draft proposal separately with USDel on the same day. Russia indicated that it would continue to push its proposal in the FSC if it is unsuccessful in Athens. Washington, please see guidance request in paragraph 5.

[1](#)2. (C) France called a brief Quad meeting (U.S., UK, France, and Germany) before the October 21 FSC plenary to share preliminary reactions to the Russian proposal. Although no Quad member yet had official instructions from capital, Germany and France appeared to lean in favor of Russia's draft proposal. France (Simonet) said it could support but not co-sponsor the proposal. Simonet's preliminary instructions from Paris also suggested language in the beginning of the draft that would, alongside VD99, "underline the importance of the CFE regime, which forms the cornerstone of European security." Germany mentioned that in the small meeting Ulyanov emphasized the importance of attaining consensus at 56 and, therefore, Russia had refrained from inserting wide measures (such as naval CSBMs) into the proposed text. Ulyanov advocated this proposal as a small step, according to Germany. German rep Risse added that the weight of the document should not be overestimated.

[1](#)3. (C) The UK and U.S. were more cautionary. The UK (Gare) was concerned that engaging on the Russian proposal would only amount to failure. Gare also indicated that it looked as though Russia had invited to its small group meeting only those countries which perhaps "were easy to pick off the Alliance." She also considered "poor timing" the introduction of this proposal given ongoing START ) and CFE

) negotiations. USDel echoed the timing as premature since participating States were still developing positions with respect to the Corfu Process and European security, writ large - of which VD99 was a key factor ) and warned of the risk in getting ahead of our authorities. USDel also observed that the Quad had not yet considered possible collective benefit(s) we would want to see and what provisions we would not want to risk losing in any process that would "update VD99."

¶4. (SBU) Ulyanov privately assured USDel that the draft had originated "in Moscow at top levels." He suggested the proposal was "non-ambitious" since it only called for "a review to identify areas" for improvement. COMMENT: On several occasions Ulyanov has ambiguously ticked off those VD99 chapters that Russia believes are not working well as outlined in Russia's Food for Thought paper, "Analysis of the Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999," distributed on February 20 for discussion at the March Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (FSC.AIAM/2/09). Ulyanov delivered a lengthy presentation following the AIAM at the March 25 FSC wherein he called for a review of VD99, see ref a. He again spoke at length on the same subject during this week's FSC (septel). END COMMENT. Ulyanov said Russia purposefully drafted the proposal with a weaker formulation in order to avoid the need to negotiate. He also said Russia was not obliged to a new version of VD99 by the end of 2010 in order not to complicate work on "nonproliferation, START, and additional issues."

¶5. (SBU) Ulyanov said he had meant "to avoid surprises," by giving a limited number of FSC delegations, including the U.S., an opportunity to review the draft proposal before he

USOSCE 00000235 002 OF 002

tabled it at the next FSC (October 28) as a delegation paper with a view toward Athens. Russia will convene again the small group of countries on October 27 to share feedback from capitals. The German rep (Risse) asked for the U.S. position, or, at the minimum, some specific points, by this week's end, so that Germany could be aware in advance of the small group meeting. Mission requests guidance on Russia's proposal for Quad discussions and the October 28 FSC.

¶6. (C) COMMENT: Mission recommends working with Russia to re-craft its proposal to call for an examination of individual CSBM decisions adopted since the last VD99 to determine whether they are more appropriate as stand-alone measures or should be incorporated into Vienna Document or another OSCE instrument. In line with Department guidance, per ref b, this would provide minimal risk from getting too far ahead of outcomes regarding the Corfu Process, European security, and CFE. It would demonstrate to Russia and those delegations inclined to support Russia's proposal some activity without opening the door for the development of new CSBMs when Russia is failing to show commitment to existing obligations. In the meantime, it would give us time to reflect on hard questions: Considering Russia is intent on following through on some form of a VD99 review process, how should we manage this apparently Moscow-driven initiative (which seems to have gained support among those OSCE delegations eager to show relevance to the FSC efforts on "VD99: ten years later"? What can we not afford to lose? END COMMENT.

----- Begin text of Russian proposal -----

The Ministerial Council,  
UNDERLINING the paramount importance of the Vienna Document 1999 for maintain and enhancing confidence and security in the OSCE region,  
NOTING the evolution of political and security environment in the region as well as technological developments and experience gained over the last 10 years since the adoption of the Vienna Document in its present form,  
RECOGNIZING that the CSBMs regime would benefit from taking into account, to the extent necessary, the changed realities,

¶1. Tasks the Forum for Security Cooperation:

-- to conduct a review of the Vienna Document 1999 in order to identify areas and provisions that require updating and further development and to address the relevant findings, as

appropriate;

-- to report on the results of this work to the next OSCE  
Ministerial meeting in Astana.

¶2. Underlines that the Vienna Document 1999 should be  
further implemented in full until a new version is adopted.

----- End text -----

CHRISTENSEN